

Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated November 20, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Claims 15-45 are currently pending. Claims 1-15 and 46-62 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 15, 18, 24, 26, 35 and 40 have been amended.

Interview Summary

A telephone interview was conducted on February 1, 2007 between Applicants' representative, Arno Naeckel, and Examiner Nawaz. During the interview it was discussed that although the terms "application", "version" and "key-value pairs" appeared somewhere in the text of the Shiman reference, Shiman failed to describe the recitation that the data schema comprises at least an APP table, a version table and an APARM table is being considered as an amendment. The Examiner indicated that an additional amendment clarifying the relationship between the tables and their operation would be helpful. The Examiner requested that written amendments and/or arguments be submitted for consideration.

103 Rejections

Claims 15-45 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Weschler (U.S. Patent 6,757,720) in view of Shiman (U.S. Pat. App. 2002/0019827). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Office Action rejects amended independent claim 1 by asserting that Weschler teaches most of the claims but concedes that Weschler fails to describe that the means for storing and maintaining comprises at least an APP table that maintains an entry for each application, a version table that maintains an entry for each version under each application and an APARM table that contains key value pairs. The Office Action asserts that Shiman cures this discrepancy and cites paragraphs 100-101 and 194-196 of Shiman in support.

However, Applicants respectfully disagree and point out that Shiman fails to describe the subject matter asserted to Shiman by the Office Action. Independent claim 15 recites, in pertinent part:

“[a]n application properties server network comprising...means for storing and maintaining a system of configuration variable data coupled to said means for performing configuration services wherein the means for storing and maintaining comprises at least an APP table that maintains an entry for each application, a version table that maintains an entry for each version under each application and an APARM table that contains key value pairs...”

Although Shiman serendipitously mentions the terms “application”, “version” and a “hash table of key value pairs” somewhere in its description, Shiman does not describe the use of “an APP table that maintains an entry for each application, a version table that maintains an entry for each version under each application and an APARM table that contains key-configuration data pairs”.

The cited paragraphs of Shiman merely describe inserting e-mail objects into a database and that each user is represented in the database by user object which is represented as a hash table of key and value pairs. (¶¶ 100-101). The second cited set of paragraphs are concerned with a user confirming that a file is valid before inserting it into a repository. (¶¶ 100-101). The cited paragraphs in particular and Shiman in general fail to describe that the “means for storing and maintaining comprises at least an APP table that maintains an entry for each application, a version table that maintains an entry for each version under each application”. In Shiman there is no description of a table that maintains an entry for an *application* and there is no *version table* for each application. Since Shiman fails to describe the claim elements asserted to it by the Office Action, Shiman fails to cure the conceded deficiencies of Weschler.

However, in the interest of an efficient prosecution, amended independent claims 15, 26 and 35 clarify the nature of the recitations. Amended independent claims 15, 26 and 35 recite similar subject matter. As a representative sample, amended independent claim 15 recites:

“[a]n application properties server network...wherein the request for configuration data includes at least an application ID and a key, wherein further the key is a data string that identifies the key to the configuration variable data being requested; means for storing and maintaining a system of configuration variable data coupled to said means for performing configuration services wherein the means for storing and

maintaining comprises at least an APP table that maintains an entry for each application ID, a version table that maintains an entry for each version under each application ID and an APARM table that contains key-configuration variable data pairs associated with each version...”.

Applicant’s respectfully assert that neither Weschler nor Shiman describes that “the request for configuration data includes at least an application ID and a key, wherein further the key is a data string that identifies the key to the configuration variable being requested; means for storing and maintaining a system of configuration variable data coupled to said means for performing configuration services wherein the means for storing and maintaining comprises at least an APP table that maintains an entry for each application ID, a version table that maintains an entry for each version under each application ID and an APARM table that contains key-configuration variable data pairs associated with each version”. Therefore the combination of Weschler and Shiman fails to describe all of the claim recitations. As such, amended independent claim 15 is allowable over the combination of Weschler and Shiman for at least these reasons. Amended independent claims 26 and 35 recite similar claim elements, therefore amended independent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Dependent claims 16-25, 27-34 and 36-45 depend from allowable independent claims 15, 26 and 35 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 18, 26 and 40

The Office Action rejects claims 18 and 40 by asserting that Weschler describes that the means for interfacing said plurality of client application servers to said means for performing configuration services includes a common database access library. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portion of Weschler (Col. 8, l. 21-43; Col. 16, l. 44-51) describe that every profile instance includes one or more remote protocol adapters where each protocol adapter implements a transport protocol be it HTTP, XML or otherwise.

Amended claim 18 recites, in pertinent part:

“means for interfacing said plurality of client application servers to said means for performing configuration services includes a common database access library, wherein said common database access library allows changes in said means for performing configuration services without affecting said plurality of client application servers.”

Applicants assert that multiple remote protocol adapters, one for each profile service instance created during a session, are not a **common** database access library. As such, the combination of Weschler fails to describe the subject matter asserted to Weschler by the Office Action. Shiman, is directed to a system that manages documents and their different versions. Shiman does not appear to describe means for interfacing said plurality of client application servers to said means for performing configuration services includes a common database access library. Therefore, since neither Weschler nor Schiman describes means for interfacing said plurality of client application servers to said means for performing configuration services includes a common database access library then their combination fails to describe each and every claim element, and claim 18 is allowable for at least this reason. Claims 26 and 40 recite similar subject matter and are therefore allowable over the combination of Weschler and Schiman for at least this same reason.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 15-45 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due other than the fee for an RCE. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 19, 2007

/Arno Naeckel/

Arno Naeckel
Reg. No. 56,411

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(678) 565-4748